

RemarksClaim Objections:

Claims 11-17 were objected to because of informalities. In particular, in claim 11, lines 13-14, the term "the gradient vector" should be --the gradient matrix--. Additionally Claims 12-17 were objected to by virtue of their dependency. In response, these claims have been amended accordingly.

Rejections Under 35 USC 112:

Claims 18-20 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, the claims were held to be narrative in form, and do not contain positively recited steps of a specific process. In response, the Applicants have amended the claims accordingly.

Regarding the Amended Claims:

Regarding amended claim 1; this claim was amended to include those limitations allowed in claim 2. Since claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 1 is now in proper condition for allowance.

Regarding amended claim 8; this claim was amended to include those limitations allowed in claim 9. Since claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 8 is now in proper condition for allowance.

Regarding amended claim 18; this claim was amended to include those limitations presumably allowed in claim 19. Since claim 19 would presumably be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 18 is now in proper condition for allowance.

Regarding independent claims 21-23, these claims were amended to overcome the Examiner's 35 USC 101 rejection. Because of this, claims 21-23 are now in proper condition for allowance.

Regarding all other claims; because these claims depend from allowable base claims, all other claims are now in proper condition for allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. As the Applicant has overcome all substantive rejections given by the Examiner the Applicant contends that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's rejections to the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter. Finally, please charge any fees (including extension of time fees) or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502117.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Thomas, ET AL.

by: 

Kenneth A. Haas  
Reg. No. 42,614  
Phone: (847) 576-6937  
FAX: (847) 576-3750